

Dated: September 5, 2012



*Eileen W. Hollowell*  
Eileen W. Hollowell, Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

In re: ) Chapter 13  
MARK BOND and )  
ASHLEA BOND, ) Case No. 4:11-bk-33849-EWH  
Debtors ) **MEMORANDUM DECISION**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Mark and Ashlea Bond ("Debtors") filed a Chapter 13 petition which listed among their assets partnership interests in two limited liability companies. The respective values which Debtors assigned to these interests were challenged, and for the reasons explained below, Debtors must amend their Schedules and Chapter 13 plan in accordance with this decision.

**II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Debtors filed a Chapter 13 voluntary petition on December 13, 2011. Debtors have filed as joint individuals and list the nature of their debts as primarily consumer. In addition, Debtors' petition includes several business aliases under which Debtors have operated various retail concerns. These names are "ITP Enterprizes LLC d/b/a Green Valley Furnishings"; ITP Enterprizes LLC "FDBA Teed Off Golf"; and "AMG Enterprizes

1 LLC d/b/a/ Old Chicago Deli.” According to their Statement of Financial Affairs, Debtors  
2 own a 70% partnership interest in both ITP Enterprizes LLC (“ITP”) and AMG  
3 Enterprizes LLC (“AMG”). Schedule B states that the interest in ITP is worth \$3,000 and  
4 that the interest in AMG is worth \$5,000. Schedule I reflects that Debtors earn \$3,300 in  
5 monthly income from their ongoing partnerships in Green Valley Furnishings (“Green  
6 Valley”) and Old Chicago Deli (“Old Chicago”).

8 On their Schedule F, Debtors list Prince Road Associated LLC (“PRA”),<sup>1</sup> a  
9 landlord, as an unsecured nonpriority creditor with a claim for an unspecified amount. In  
10 2008, PRA entered into a lease with Debtors and Green Valley<sup>2</sup> (“the Lease”) for a retail  
11 business location. The Lease identified the lessees as Debtors and Green Valley, but  
12 Debtors have scheduled the claim as a debt arising from a lease that ITP entered into  
13 for the purpose of doing business as Teed Off Golf. Despite this difference, there is no  
14 dispute that Debtors, with Green Valley, entered into the Lease with PRA.

16 Debtors’ Chapter 13 plan (“the Plan”), also filed on December 13, 2011,  
17 proposes to reject the Lease and claims that the Lease has been terminated. The Plan  
18 calls for Debtors to make payments of \$200 a month for thirty six months, and it  
19 provides that over the plan term Debtors will satisfy a \$1,000 priority unsecured tax  
20 claim in full while paying unsecured creditors \$2,499.

22 PRA filed an objection to the Plan on January 30, 2012. In its objection, PRA  
23 alleged that Debtors, while operating Green Valley, defaulted on the Lease in October  
24

25 <sup>1</sup> Debtors scheduled the creditor as “Prince Road Associates LLC.” However, the creditor has referred to  
26 itself as “Prince Road Associated” even though it leased commercial real property to Debtors under the  
27 name “Prince Road Associates LLC.” There is no actual dispute about the identity of the party appearing  
as PRA, and this difference is immaterial to the Court’s ruling.

28 <sup>2</sup> Despite Debtors’ bankruptcy petition listing ITP’s full name as “ITP Enterprizes LLC,” the Lease refers to  
ITP as “ITP Enterprizes LLC.” As is the case with regard to PRA, there is no actual dispute about the  
identity of ITP or Green Valley.

1 2010 and moved Green Valley to a new location without satisfying the remaining  
2 balance on the Lease. PRA initiated a lawsuit in state court to recover what it alleges  
3 was the remaining balance, \$75,551.16, but Debtors' bankruptcy case stayed that  
4 action. PRA contended that the Plan's treatment of its claim was not fair or reasonable<sup>3</sup>  
5 in light of Debtors' intention to continue operating Green Valley and Old Chicago, along  
6 with Debtors retaining their partnership interests in those businesses. Further, PRA  
7 asserted that Debtors failed to disclose a painting business that generates income for  
8 them and had not provided a full accounting of their assets, their tax returns, or the  
9 respective inventories of ITP and AMG.<sup>4</sup>

12 Debtors responded to PRA's objection on March 12, 2012. Debtors did not  
13 dispute that a default on the Lease had occurred, nor did they challenge the amount  
14 PRA seeks to recover. However, Debtors noted that PRA's claim was being treated in  
15 the same fashion as all other unsecured claims, which Debtors admitted would result in  
16 no distribution to PRA.<sup>5</sup> Debtors also disclosed that while they were 70% owners of  
17 Green Valley at the time they filed their bankruptcy petition, Green Valley was sold  
18 postpetition to a non-insider purchaser for \$3,500. Debtors claim that their partnership  
19 interest in Old Chicago is now their sole source of income.

---

24 <sup>3</sup> The Bankruptcy Code does not require that a Chapter 13 plan be "fair and reasonable," but it does  
require that a plan be proposed in "good faith." See 11 U.S.C. 1325(a)(3).

25 <sup>4</sup> If PRA's allegations are correct, Debtors could not satisfy the requirement of 11 U.S.C. 1325(a)(4) that  
26 property of the estate distributed through a Chapter 13 plan equal the amount unsecured creditors would  
receive through a Chapter 7 liquidation.

27 <sup>5</sup> Debtors did not explain how PRA would be treated like all other unsecured creditors but nonetheless  
28 receive no distribution given that Debtors' Plan calls for unsecured creditors to receive a pro-rata share of  
the \$2,499 allocated for unsecured claims.

1 On July 11, 2012, the Court held an evidentiary hearing to address the value of  
2 Debtors' partnership interests and the Plan.<sup>6</sup> PRA argued that Debtors had undervalued  
3 Green Valley and Old Chicago. According to PRA, just before the hearing Debtors  
4 provided tax records to PRA which showed that Green Valley had gross receipts of  
5 \$185,000 and gross profits of \$108,000 in 2009; gross receipts of \$146,000 and gross  
6 profits of \$68,000 in 2010; and gross receipts of \$217,000 and gross profits of \$139,000  
7 in 2011. PRA argued that it had similar reason to believe that Debtors had sold their  
8 interest in Old Chicago for \$200,000 in 2008 before reacquiring it, and that Old Chicago  
9 had gross receipts of \$380,000 and gross profits of \$108,000 in 2011. As a result, PRA  
10 challenged the accuracy of the scheduled values for Green Valley and Old Chicago that  
11 Debtors listed on their Schedule B.  
12

14 Mark Bond ("Bond") testified at the hearing that Green Valley had been sold for  
15 \$3,500, a price which included a truck owned by the business valued at \$3,000. Bond  
16 explained that Green Valley was a consignment-furniture operation, and it had owned  
17 little or no inventory outright. In any event, on the date of the hearing,<sup>7</sup> Debtors no  
18 longer maintained an interest in that business.  
19

20 Bond also said that he had received approximately \$70,000 from the sale of Old  
21 Chicago in 2008 but took back the business after the purchaser could not make  
22 required payments for the full \$200,000 purchase price. When questioned about how he  
23

---

24  
25 <sup>6</sup> The Court acknowledges that in addition to disputing certain financial information provided by Debtors,  
26 the PRA objection to the Plan also took issue with how the Plan treats PRA's claim. This opinion does not  
27 address PRA's Plan treatment, and PRA retains all rights to pursue that issue if Debtors file an amended  
28 plan.

<sup>7</sup> For purposes of plan confirmation, assets are valued as of the effective date of the plan, and that date  
cannot be earlier than the original date of plan confirmation. In re Gibson, 415 B.R. 735 (Bankr. Ariz.  
2009).

1 valued his partnership interests in Green Valley and Old Chicago, Bond explained that  
2 Green Valley's assets were limited to a truck and some used furniture, while AMG's  
3 assets included food inventory, several older pieces of restaurant equipment, and  
4 dining-room furniture. He assigned his own liquidation values to these items and  
5 consulted a restaurant equipment vendor for an informal appraisal of Old Chicago's  
6 assets. Bond testified that he did not consult a business broker. Bond valued Old  
7 Chicago at \$5,000.  
8

9         The Court questioned Bond about his present circumstances. Bond calculated  
10 that on a monthly basis, Old Chicago pays roughly \$1,900 in rent, maintains payroll  
11 expenses of \$7,600, incurs approximately \$3,000 in food costs, and has utility bills in  
12 excess of \$1,500. Bond testified that his current monthly income from Old Chicago is  
13 roughly \$3,000 per month, and that after accounting for all these outlays, Old Chicago  
14 loses money. However, he also explained that Old Chicago is generally profitable from  
15 October through April, and sometimes Debtors earn up to \$5,000 per month in income  
16 from its operation. Asked to clarify, Bond summarized that Old Chicago earns between  
17 \$20,000 and \$25,000 in profit per year, earnings which Debtors distribute to  
18 themselves.  
19  
20

21         At the close of testimony, the Court concluded that the Green Valley sale was  
22 conducted in good faith, and that Green Valley was not undervalued. However, the  
23 Court found that Debtors' interest in Old Chicago had been. It instructed Debtors that  
24 relying on Old Chicago's liquidation value, instead of treating it as an ongoing business,  
25 was inappropriate. Additionally, the Court asked that Debtors submit pertinent business  
26 records for the Court to review in determining the value of Old Chicago.  
27  
28

1 On July 18, Debtors filed partnership income statements for Old Chicago from  
2 2010 and 2011 along with Old Chicago's Profit & Loss statements from July 2010  
3 through June 2012.  
4

### 5 **III. ISSUE**

6 1) What is the going-concern value of Old Chicago?

7 2) Should Debtors be required to amend their calculation of disposable income to  
8 include the profits realized from the operation of Old Chicago?

9 3) If so, how should that amount be determined?  
10

### 11 **IV. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT**

12 Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1334 and 157(b)(2)(A) and (L).

### 13 **V. DISCUSSION**

#### 14 Going-Concern Value

15 Determining the going-concern value of a business for the purpose of calculating  
16 a Chapter 13 debtor's ownership interest is not a common topic for bankruptcy courts.  
17 In the Ninth Circuit, most Chapter 13 cases that have addressed going-concern value  
18 have focused on how to calculate the value of collateral securing a claim. See, e.g.,  
19 Ardmor Vending Co. v. Kim (In re Kim), 130 F.3d 863 (9th Cir. 1997); Taffi v. United  
20 States (In re Taffi), 68 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1995). Cases on point are similarly scarce in  
21 other circuits; they, too, have focused inquiries into going-concern value on how to  
22 properly value secured claims. See, e.g., GMAC v. Valenti (In re Valenti), 105 F.3d 55  
23 (2nd Cir. 1997); Winthrop Old Farm Nurseries v. New Bedford Inst. for Sav. (In re  
24 Winthrop Old Farm Nurseries), 50 F.3d 72 (1st Cir. 1995); Associates Commer. Corp. v.  
25 Rash (In re Rash), 31 F.3d 325 (5th Cir. 1994); see also Keith M. Lundin & William H.  
26  
27  
28

1 Brown, CHAPTER 13 BANKRUPTCY, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, § 108.1, at ¶ 21, Sec. Rev. Apr. 14, 2009.

2 Despite this absence of direct authority, Taffi and Kim contain reasoning which the  
3 Court can apply to this case.

4 In Taffi, the IRS sought to enforce a tax lien on a home that the debtors were  
5 going to retain through their plan of reorganization. The Ninth Circuit had to consider  
6 which method was appropriate for determining the value of collateral retained by a  
7 debtor for debtor's own use. The Ninth Circuit held that when a Chapter 13 debtor  
8 "intends to retain property subject to a lien" and "the proposed use of the property is  
9 continued retention by the debtor, the purpose of the valuation is to determine how  
10 much the creditor will receive for the debtor's continued possession." Taffi v. United  
11 States, 96 F.3d at 1192.

12 The Ninth Circuit panel in Kim expanded upon this rationale. Addressing a  
13 Chapter 13 plan which treated one secured claimant as only partially secured and  
14 another as wholly unsecured, the Ninth Circuit instructed, "In light of Taffi," where the  
15 debtors "continu[e] to operate the business...valuation should [be] based on the...use or  
16 disposition to be made of the interest, which in this case means the continued operation  
17 of the business in the same location." In re Kim, 130 F.3d at 865. The Kim decision  
18 rejected the debtors' attempt to value two pieces of business equipment calculated as if  
19 the property were going to be liquidated because the equipment was not going to be  
20 sold but, instead, used to sustain an ongoing business. Id.

21 In the present case, Debtors do not seek to determine the value of a secured  
22 claim. However, Debtors have proposed a liquidation value for their interest in Old  
23 Chicago which ignores that the business is a going concern and that Debtors will  
24

1 operate it. As Taffi and Kim concluded, this sort of circumstance requires that Debtors  
2 calculate a value which reflects what creditors may receive from Debtors' continued  
3 possession and operation. That valuation should be calculated on a going-concern  
4 basis.

5  
6 There are various methods which can be used to calculate the value of a  
7 business. The Ninth Circuit has not articulated one preferred standard. The method  
8 preferred in the Second and Seventh Circuits is discounted cash flow ("DCF"). "Many  
9 authorities recognize that the most reliable method for determining the value of a  
10 business is the discounted cash flow...method." Lippe v. Bairnco Corp., 288 B.R. 678,  
11 689 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (citing Frymire-Brinati v. KPMG Peat Marwick, 2 F.3d 183, 186 (7th  
12 Cir. 1993) (DCF is "the methodology that experts in valuation find essential"); Shannon  
13 P. Pratt et al., VALUING A BUSINESS: THE ANALYSIS & APPRAISAL OF CLOSELY HELD  
14 COMPANIES 154 (4th ed. 2000) ("Regardless of what valuation approach is used, in order  
15 for it to make rational economic sense from a financial point of view, the results should  
16 be compatible with what would result if a well-supported discounted economic income  
17 analysis were carried out."))

18  
19  
20 At the Court's request, Debtors filed several recent income and profit and loss  
21 statements for Old Chicago. To the extent that the Court left the impression that it would  
22 use that information to calculate a going-concern value for Old Chicago, the Court was  
23 in error. The Court is not qualified to conduct such an analysis. That is a task for  
24 Debtors, as owners of the interest in Old Chicago, or an expert they hire. The Court is  
25 aware that in Chapter 13 cases the parties have limited resources to retain experts.  
26 While Debtors must calculate a going-concern value for Old Chicago, nothing in this  
27  
28



1 decision prevents Debtors from using a different methodology than that suggested by  
2 the Court. Nor does this decision prevent PRA from retaining a business broker or some  
3 other expert to provide an opinion regarding the going-concern value of Old Chicago.

#### 4 Chapter 13 Disposable Income

5  
6 In addition to amending the value of their interest in Old Chicago, Debtors also  
7 must amend their calculation of disposable income. Under Section 1304,<sup>8</sup> “[a] debtor  
8 that is self-employed and incurs trade credit in the production of income from such  
9 employment is engaged in business,” and such a debtor is authorized to operate that  
10 business during the pendency of a Chapter 13 case. Debtors qualify as self-employed  
11 and engaged in business.  
12

13 In order to confirm a Chapter 13 plan when an unsecured creditor objects, a  
14 debtor must propose to pay all projected disposable income to unsecured creditors  
15 under the plan. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(1)(B). When calculating “disposable income,” a  
16 debtor engaged in business may deduct expenses “necessary for the continuation,  
17 preservation, and operation of such business.” 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(2)(B).  
18

19 In this case, Debtors have testified that despite experiencing seasonal earnings  
20 fluctuations, Old Chicago yields between \$20,000 and \$25,000 annually in profits which  
21 Debtors pay to themselves in addition to monthly wages of \$3,000. This profit must be  
22 added in when calculating the income which Debtors apply to their plan. As a leading  
23 treatise instructs, “The net business income available after payment of all necessary  
24 business expenses is...the starting amount from which personal expenses are deducted  
25  
26  
27

28 <sup>8</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all chapter and section references are to the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532. The Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Rules 1001-9037, are referred to as “Rules.” The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are referred to as “Civil Rules.”

1 to arrive at projected disposable income.” Lundin & Brown, CHAPTER 13 BANKRUPTCY,  
2 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, § 167.1, at ¶ 3, Sec. Rev. Apr. 14, 2009.

### 3 VI. CONCLUSION

4 Debtors’ Schedules and Plan undervalue their ownership interest in Old Chicago  
5 as a going concern and violate § 1325 by failing to adequately account for all disposable  
6 income. As a result, the Court will enter a separate Order on this date requiring that  
7 Debtors calculate the going-concern value of their 70% interest in Old Chicago<sup>9</sup> and  
8 amend their Schedules and Plan to reflect this calculation along with the \$20,000-  
9 \$25,000 in additional annual income earned from Old Chicago.  
10

11 Dated and signed above.

12  
13 Notice to be sent through  
14 the Bankruptcy Noticing Center  
15 to the following:

16 Ashlea Bond  
17 Mark Bond  
18 1311 W. Calle de la Plaza  
19 Sahuarita, AZ 85629

20 H. Lee Horner, Jr.  
21 Goldstein, Horner & Horner  
22 P.O. Box 2665  
23 Cortaro, AZ 85652

24 Karl MacOmber  
25 Monroe McDonough Goldschmidt & Molla, PLLC  
26 4578 N. First Ave., Ste. 160  
27 Tucson, AZ 85718

28 Dianne Kerns  
29 7320 N. La Cholla #154 PMB 413  
30 Tucson, AZ 85741

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

<sup>9</sup> If PRA wishes to challenge Debtors’ amended valuation, PRA may do so by filing an objection to the amended Chapter 13 plan.

1 U.S. Trustee  
2 230 N. First Ave., Ste. 204  
3 Phoenix, AZ 85003  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28